3/2/71

Dear Moo,

It seems that whenever I feel I must engage in the futility of writing you I am busier than my usual busy, tireder than my usual tiredness, and just a little more persuaded that is anything is a complete futility, this is it.

As you see, I am consistent in being diplomatic and tactful, those rare qualities all of you so admired in me!

I have just returned from an exhausting and perhaps my most successful investigating trip. It was not for the purpose of which I write. I knew that what would follow might be possible, and I squeezed it in.

There is now in my possession a tape of an interview with a total stranger, one previously entirely unknown to me and neverindicated by your or anyone in your office, that amounts to a total destruction of Shaw's alibi and, I think, enough to charge Cobb with perjury. As you may remember, I wrote you at the time of the trial that I was then satisfied he had committed perjury, although then and now I am without an explanation of why that completely satisfies me. I didn't then and do not now buy the obvious one.

There is no doubt of the credibility of this man, no possibility of suspicion of his motices (he doesn't even know what he told me means), and least of all is there any possibility of doubt of his being in a position to know. I didn't go into substantian with him because I didn't want to tell him the meaning of what he told me. If that time ever comes, I will do that only with someone like you present. But he will be able to substantiate his being in a position to know with contemporaneous records the existence of which I am confident is currently important to him.

I realize this is elliptical. That is my intention. I think by this time you should have a pretty good understanding of why.

Had I been home yesterday (I didn't get home until after dark), I'd have another witness substantiating this one. He phoned before I returned. If he phones again, I will talk to him. If he doesn't phone, I won't phone him. I can locate him whenever I want, for while I have never been where he lives, I do know, and if you ever know the coincidence in the name of the city will blow your mind. It is no more than coincidence, has no significance at all. This second man is more than just a corroborating witness. Independently he could swear to exactly the same things from his own personal knowledge, and there is no possibility of doubt of his being in a position to know. I have that proof in hand. He was not entirely unknown to me, although I had a different interest in him and still do.

If you have anything to say, you should also be able to anticipate what I will want to hear. Best regards to everyone,

Sincerely,